UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,961	01/18/2002	Joseph R. Berger	44657-AAA-PCT-US/JPW	3958
7590 03/26/2007 John P. White		EXAMINER WANG, SHENGJUN		
Cooper & Dunham LLP				
1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1617 2		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	03/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/052,961	BERGER, JOSEPH R.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Shengjun Wang	1617				
David for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
Period fo	· •		/a\ a= = == //a\ = 1/a				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS UNSURED FOR THE MAILING TH	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 De	ecember 2006.					
·		action is non-final.					
3)							
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 88-101 is/are pending in the application	on.					
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	s)⊠ Claim(s) <u>88-101</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•	·				
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers		•				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachmen							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 💢 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
`Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date	6)	•				

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of applicants' amendments and remarks submitted December 26, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 88-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metcalf et al. (of record), in view of ANAVAR® (of record, provided by applicant in IDS filed October 13, 2005), and Babu et al. (US 5,073,380).

Metcalf teach a method of using oxandrolone for nitrogen retention wherein the daily of amounts of oxandrolone are from 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg, and up to 150 mg. Oxandrolone were taken as single dosage daily. See, particularly, Method at page 60. Metcalf also teach that the optima dosage is about 25 mg or 30 mg a day.

Metcalf et al. do teaches expressly a dosage forms comprising 10 mg of oxandrolone and the particular pharmaceutical excipients herein.

However, Anavar® disclosed an oxandrolone tablet, wherein the inactive ingredients includes corn starch, lactose, magnesium stearate and methylcellulose. Anavar® further reveals that daily dosage of oxandrolone may be up to 20 mg/day. See the entire document. Babu et al. disclosed that hydroxypropyl methylcellulose is a typical excipient for tablet formulation. See, column 2, lines 6-8.

Art Unit: 1617

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed invention was made, to make a dosage composition comprising 10 mg of oxandrolone, and the particular excipients herein as the excipients herein are well-known pharmaceutical excipients and are particularly known to be useful in solid dosage forms.

Page 3

The 10 mg would have been obvious in view the fact that it have been used in the amount of 10 mg, 20 mg, and up to 150 mg. Making a tablet with 10 mg of oxandrolone for those use more than 10 mg a time.

As to the intended use recited in the claims (for daily dosage, or not), note it is well settled that the "intended use" of a product or composition will not further limit claims drawn to a product or composition. See, e.g., <u>In re Hack</u> 114 USPQ 161.

Response to the Arguments

Applicants' amendments, exhibits and remarks submitted December 26, 2006 have been fully considered, but are essentially moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

2. As to the remarks that Metcalf require 25 to 30 mg as optimal daily dosage, the examiner found the arguments are not helpful to the claimed invention, which is a dosage forms, not a method. Based on Metcalf's teaching, 10 mg tablet would have been obvious. Applicants further contend that Metcalf does not teach a solid unit dosage, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the *knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.* See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Solid dosage form is knowledge

Art Unit: 1617

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, ANAVAR® provides further evidence for that. The cited references as a whole clearly teach, or suggest daily dosage amount of oxandrolone be more than 10 mg, therefore making a tablet containing 10 mg of oxandrolone would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art.

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/052,961 Page 5

Art Unit: 1617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shengjun Wang Primary Examiner Art Unit 1617